



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,324	02/26/2002	Anatoliy Panasyuk	CTX-079	4049
7590	09/07/2005		EXAMINER	
Patent Administrator Testa, Hurwitz & Thibeault, LLP High Street Tower 125 High Street Boston, MA 02110			HENNING, MATTHEW T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	
DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/083,324	PANASYUK ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Matthew T. Henning	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-68 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-68 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/26/02, 11/24/03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

1 This action is in response to the communication filed on 2/26/2002.

2 **DETAILED ACTION**

3 Claims 1-68 have been examined.

4 *Title*

5 The title of the invention is acceptable.

6 *Priority*

7 This application has no priority claimed.

8 Therefore, the effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in
9 this application is 2/26/2002.

10 *Information Disclosure Statement*

11 The information disclosure statement(s) (IDS) submitted on 7/26/2002, and 11/24/2003
12 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering
13 the information disclosure statements.

14 *Drawings*

15 The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every
16 feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the disabled ticket and the enabled
17 ticket, as well as the step of enabling the disabled ticket must be shown or the feature(s) canceled
18 from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

19 Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to
20 the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing
21 sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet,
22 even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing

1 should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure
2 must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must
3 be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the
4 drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the
5 renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an
6 application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet"
7 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will
8 be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The
9 objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

15 Claims 3, 5, 7-13, 33-37, 51-52, and 57-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second
16 paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject
17 matter which applicant regards as the invention.

18 Claims 3, 5, 7-13 recite the limitation "said ticket authority". There is insufficient
19 antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 33-37 and 57-61 recite the limitation “a disabled second ticket”. It is unclear whether this is a disabled version of the “second ticket” of claim 23 or 45, or whether this is meant to be a different second ticket separate from the second ticket of claim 23. As such the ordinary person skilled in the art would be unable to determine the scope of the claim. Therefore

1 claims 33-37 and 57-61 are rejected for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the
2 subject matter which the applicants regard as the invention.

3 Claims 51-52 recite the limitation “said second ticket”. It is unclear whether this is
4 referring to the “disabled second ticket” or the “enabled second ticket”. As such, the ordinary
5 person skilled in the art would be unable to determine the scope of the claim. Therefore claims
6 51-52 are rejected for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter
7 which the applicants regard as the invention.

8 ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the
10 basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

11 *A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –*

12 *(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section
13 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or
14 (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the
15 invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the
16 treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an
17 application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
18 States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.*

19
20 Claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64, and 66-68 are rejected under 35
21 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brezak et al. (US Patent Application Publication
22 2003/0018913) hereinafter referred to as Brezak.

23 Regarding claim 1, Brezak disclosed a method of authenticating a client to a content
24 server (See Brezak Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising the steps of: generating a ticket associated
25 with said client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043), said ticket comprising a first ticket and a
26 second ticket wherein said second ticket is disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043

1 and 0045); transmitting said first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraph 0042-0043);
2 validating said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045-0048); using said first ticket to
3 establish a communication session with a content server proxy after said first ticket is validated
4 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043-0045); enabling said second ticket for use upon said validation of
5 said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048); and using said enabled second ticket to
6 establish a communication session with said content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048).

7 Regarding claim 23, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
8 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202; a ticket authority (See
9 Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206); a content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 214); and a content
10 server proxy (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) in communication with said client, said ticket
11 authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2), wherein said ticket authority generates a
12 ticket associated with said client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043), said ticket comprising a
13 first ticket and a second ticket, wherein said first ticket is transmitted to said client and used to
14 establish a first communication session with said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs
15 0042-0043 and 0045), and wherein said second ticket is transmitted to said content server proxy
16 and used to establish a second communication session with said content server (See Brezak
17 Paragraphs 0043 and 0045).

18 Regarding claim 45, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
19 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority
20 generating a ticket associated with said client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206 and Paragraphs
21 0042-0043), said ticket comprising a first ticket and a second ticket wherein said second ticket is
22 disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); a content server (See Brezak

1 Fig. 2 Element 214); a content server proxy in communication with said client, said ticket
2 authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) and receiving said first ticket
3 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0044); and a web server in communication with said client and
4 said ticket authority (See Brezak Fig. 1 Element 178 and Paragraphs 0031-0032), wherein said
5 content server proxy establishes a first communication session protocol between said client and
6 said content server proxy after said ticket authority validates said first ticket (See Brezak
7 Paragraphs 0043-0045), wherein said ticket authority enables said second ticket after said
8 validation of said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048), and wherein said content
9 server proxy uses said enabled second ticket to establish a second communication session
10 protocol being different from said first communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraph
11 0045).

12 Regarding claim 67, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
13 Abstract and Fig.2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a first ticket authority
14 (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 204 and Paragraph 0040); a second ticket authority (See Brezak Fig.
15 2 Element 206 and Paragraph 0040); a content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 214); and a
16 content server proxy in communication with said client, said first ticket authority, and said
17 content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210), wherein said first ticket authority generates a
18 first ticket associated with said client, wherein said second ticket authority generates a second
19 ticket associated with said content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0040, 0042-0043 and 0045),
20 wherein said first ticket is transmitted to said client and used to establish a first communication
21 session with said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045), and wherein said

1 second ticket is transmitted to said content server proxy and used to establish a second
2 communication session with said content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045).

3 Regarding claim 68, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
4 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising; means for generating a ticket associated with a client, said
5 ticket comprising a first ticket and a second ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045);
6 means for transmitting said first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043); means
7 for using said first ticket to establish a first communication session with a content server proxy
8 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045); means for transmitting said second ticket to said
9 content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045-0048); and means for using said
10 second ticket to establish a second communication session with a content server (See Brezak
11 Paragraphs 0045-0048).

12 Regarding claims 2, 24, and 46, Brezak disclosed that prior to generating said ticket
13 associated with said client, said client is authenticated with a web server (See Brezak Paragraphs
14 0042-0043).

15 Regarding claims 3, 25, and 47-48, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority transmits
16 said first ticket to a web server and said web server transmits said first ticket to said client (See
17 Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032).

18 Regarding claims 4, 26, and 49, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first ticket
19 to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0043 and 0044).

20 Regarding claims 5, 27, and 50-51, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy
21 transmits said first ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority transmits said second

1 ticket to said content server proxy upon validation of said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs
2 0045-0048).

3 Regarding claims 6, 10, 28,32, 52 and 56, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy
4 transmits said second ticket to said content server upon said enabling of said second ticket (See
5 Brezak Paragraph 0036 and 0045).

6 Regarding claims 11, 33-34, and 57-58, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority
7 transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to a web server and said web server
8 transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs
9 0031-0032 and 0042-0043).

10 Regarding claims 12, 35, and 59, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first
11 ticket and said disabled second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043
12 and 0044).

13 Regarding claim 13, Brezak disclosed transmitting said disabled second ticket to at least
14 one of said content server proxy and a web server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043).

15 Regarding claims 36, and 60, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy transmits
16 said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority
17 enables said disabled second ticket (See Brezak Paragraph 0045).

18 Regarding claims 14, 37, and 61, Brezak disclosed transmitting said enabled second
19 ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0048).

20 Regarding claims 15, 38, and 62, Brezak disclosed that a communication session protocol
21 is established between said client and said content server (See Brezak Paragraph 0036).

1 Regarding claims 16-17, 39-40, and 63-64, Brezak disclosed that a first communication
2 session protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second
3 communication session protocol is established between said content server proxy and said
4 content server, wherein said first communication session protocol is different from said second
5 communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0036 and 0043).

6 Regarding claims 18-19, and 41-42, Brezak disclosed that a first communication session
7 protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second
8 communication session protocol is established between said client and a web server, wherein
9 said first communication session protocol is different from said second communication session
10 protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032 and 0043).

11 Regarding claims 21, 44, and 66, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy is a
12 secure socket layer relay (See Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049, and 0053).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
15 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

16 *A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or*
17 *described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter*
18 *sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have*
19 *been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to*
20 *which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which*
21 *the invention was made.*

23 Claims 20, 22, 43, and 65 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
24 Brezak. Brezak a client system including many features such as accessing web sites (See Brezak
25 Paragraphs 0005 and 0016-0033), and transmitting a second ticket to a proxy server for the use

1 of a specifically identified server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049), but failed to disclose that
2 the client comprised a web browser or that the server was identified by its address. It was well
3 known in the art at the time of invention that computers had web browsers for accessing web
4 sites. It was further well known in the art at the time of invention that servers were identified by
5 their address. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at
6 the time of invention to provide the client with a web browser and to identify the target server by
7 its address. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would
8 have been motivated to apply what was well known and common in the art at the time.

9 Claims 7-9, 29-31, and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
10 over Brezak as applied to claims 1, 23, and 45 above, and further in view of Litai et al. (US
11 Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0233554) hereinafter referred to as Litai.

12 Brezak disclosed accessing a target server through a proxy server using a service ticket
13 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048) but failed to disclose the specific method used for the target
14 server to verify the service ticket.

15 Litai teaches that in a ticketing system, in order for a server to verify a service ticket, the
16 server sends the ticket to the ticket server (See Litai Paragraph 0046).

17 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
18 invention to employ the teachings of Litai in the ticketing system by having the target server
19 send the service ticket to the trusted third party in order to have the ticket verified. This would
20 have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to
21 protect the server from unauthorized access.

22

Art Unit: 2131

Conclusion

Claims 1-68 have been rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
FBI should be directed to Matthew T. Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

10 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
11 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
12 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
13 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
14 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

15

16

17 

18 Matthew Henning
19 Assistant Examiner
20 Art Unit 2131
21 8/31/2005

Ayaz Sheikh
AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

22